DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 706 CS 003 147

AUTHOR Paterra, Mary Elizabeth
TITLE A Comparison of the Informal Reading Inventory and the Reading Miscue Inventory.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Informal Reading Inventory; *Miscue Analysis; *Oral Reading; Reading Ability; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Tests

ABSTRACT

The Informal Reading Inventory and the Reading Miscue Inventory are compared as to purpose, origins, and methods of use. A tabular format, elaborated by an appended discussion, summarizes each inventory's purpose, materials, length, difficulty of selections, procedures in testing, types of behaviors evaluated, and resulting scores. (AA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED133706

A Comparison of the Informal Reading Inventory and the Reading Miscue Inventory

Mary Elizabeth Paterra
12906 Forest View Drive
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

CS003 147

A Comparison of the Informal Reading Inventory and the Reading Miscue Inventory

A comparison of the Informal Reading Inventory and the Reading Miscue Inventory shows that while both are subjective measures of oral reading accuracy and comprehension, each has a different purpose. While both examine reading performance they cannot be used interchangeably, yet their results show overlap.

The Informal Reading Inventory developed as a reaction to the inadequacies of standardized tests of the early 1900's and through an awareness that all oral reading errors are not equally important. At the time faulty eye movements were viewed as causes for reading problems and appropriate speed in reading indicated competence (Beldin,1970).

The Reading Miscue Inventory is an extension of this reaction.

While the IRI provides a decoding accuracy score, the RMI investigates miscues as they provide insight into the strategies the reader is using to discover meaning in the text. Thus the IRI yields an error percent; the RMI yields a statistical display of the graphophonic, syntactical and semantic strengths the reader is using.

Gray was one of the early professional writers interested in analyzing reading performance in terms of oral reading errors. He observed that errors made by primary children were of a more gross nature than those made by intermediate students in elementary schools. He attributed this change to the child's growing ability to analyze words for correct pronunciation. (Beldin,1970)

Beldin also reported that Thorndike in 1934 had expressed concern about the number of oral reading errors students were making in their instructional materials. As many as two or three unknown words per page is baffling for students and makes reading uncomfortable. Goodman contends that the acquisition of reading is comparable to the acquisition of

oral language. The development of accuracy is dependent upon the ability of the reader to select cues to meaning.

Durrell in 1937 suggested that when a child is asked to read orally from material that he has never seen (using a selection of 100 words), recording the number of errors made will indicate appropriateness of the material for instruction. He suggested that more than one error in twenty words would indicate that the material is too hard. He stipulated that material to be used by the child independently should be easier(Beldin,1970).

Beldin (1970) said that Betts used an IRI similar to the one we known toady in his reading clinic at Pennsylvania State College. Betts noted that a good examiner analyzes both context clues used by the student and kind of deficiencies in word analysis as well as computing accuracy and comprehension scores. He said, further, that children can sometimes understand the meaning of a passage in spite of many "word fluency" errors.

A comparison of the materials used in the IRI and the RMI shows similarity in variety of subject, types of writing and representativeness of classroom materials the child will be using. The IRI materials are controlled as to a length so that the child will not become fatigued; the RMI material is controlled as to length such that the child can read it in its entirety within fifteen or twenty minutes.

While the IRI consists of paragraphs graded preprimer through ninth grade, the Reading Miscue Inventory requires material one level above that which is usually assigned to the student in class; this material must be difficult enough to generate a minimum of twenty-five miscues.

Establishment of examiner-student rapport is the first step in the administration of each of these informal inventories. Word

Recognition, followed by the cycle of Oral Reading, Questions, Silent Reading, Questions, Oral Rereading of the Silent Selection, and the Listening Test are explained to students taking the Informal Reading Inventory. The Reading Miscue examiner explains that the student's oral reading will be taped and that he will answer questions following his oral reading. In the Reading Miscue Inventory the student is told that he will not be helped with unknown words; examiner help is given to the student in the Informal Reading Inventory following a five-second delay to give the student a chance to work the word out on his own.

Comprehension on the Informal Reading Inventory is evaluated through examiner questions which are literal, interpretive and problem solving. The examiner may ask supplementary questions to encourage recall if the child has difficulty, but these questions must in no way give recall information directly to the student. Comprehension is evaluated for the Miscue Inventory through the Comprehension Pattern of oral reading errors, reflective of the student's use of the interaction of semantics, graphic/sound symbols and grammar, and through Retelling. Following the oral reading, the Miscue subject retells the story as he remembers it. As in the IRI, the examiner may ask questions to encourage recall, but not to give information directly to the student. Retelling is evaluated in terms of the type of material the child has read; story-type material in terms of character, events, plot and theme, information material in terms of specific information recalled, generalizations made and evidence of understanding major concept.

The oral reading accuracy for the IRI is 100% minus the composite percent of substitutions, repetitions, omissions, hesitations and words provided by the examiner.

Oral miscues on the RMI are Yes (nearly correct), Partly Correct or Not at all. Repetitions are analyzed as to why the repetitions was made: to make a correction, to change the form of the words as written, to anticipate the next word. Substitutions are classified as non-word, semantically valid, grammatically correct, graphically similar, similar in sound, dialectic substitutions, intonation and pronunciation shifts and variant forms of the stimulus word.

The Recapitulation Record for the IRI summarizes the accuracy and comprehension scores achieved on the levels of the inventory administered, suggests levels of materials appropriate for instruction and independent reading and notes the level of material which would frustrate the child. A listening, hearing, level is included. Instructional recommendations and summaries of specific word attack and comprehension skill needs are listed.

Each miscue recorded for the RMI is entered on the Reading Miscue Inventory Coding Sheet together with the text to which the reader responded. A percentage is derived which indicates the reader's use of graphic cues, sound similarity cues and grammatical function cues and to what degree each miscue affected the meaning of the text. This Comprehension Pattern and the Retelling Score are entered as statistical data on the Reader Profile. The Comprehension Pattern indicates the percent of miscues which resulted in "No Loss" of comprehension, "Partial Loss" and "Loss." The percent of miscues with "High," "Some" and "No Sound/Graphic" Relationsips and the percent of miscues with grammatically identical, indeterminate and different function are recorded on the Reader Profile. The percent of miscues which indicate reader strength, partial strength and weakness are also given. Repeated and Multiple miscues are

tallied in terms of frequency of miscue occurrence, text item occurrence and number of times each miscue was corrected.

The purpose of the Reader Profile is to indicate reading strategy lessons which will help the student become aware of, and to select, functional strategies for comprehension of the deep meaning.

Pilkulski (1974) discussed the strong case for "face validity" of the Informal Reading Inventory providing the test materials are a true sample of the materials to be used for instruction. He, further, indicated that the Informal Reading Inventory is no better than the person using it. Able examiners using the Informal Reading Inventory do analyze errors, look for dialect and shifts in intonation, recognize the use of graphic cues and sound similarity, acknowledge the roles played by grammar and semantics, and notice whether a meaning change is involved.

Both the IRI and RMI as individual informal inventories are time consuming and subjective. They are valuable as they inventory elements of reading as a process. The Informal Reading Inventory contributes to proper placement of the student in instructional materials and indicates reading needs. The Reading Miscue Inventory sights into the reading experience, identifies the reader's strengths and so indicates the direction for instruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beldin, H.O. "Informal Reading Testing: Historical Review and Review of the Research." Durr, William K. (Ed) Reading Difficulties: Diagnosis, Correction, and Remediation. IRA, 1970.

Burke, Carolyn. "The Reading Process: Oral Reading Analysis: A View of the Reading Process." Page, William (ed) Help for the Reading Teacher. National Council of Teachers of English, ERIC, 1975.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Analysis of Oral Reading Miscues: Applied Psycholinguistics." Reading Research Quarterly. V. (Fall, 1969). 9-30.

Goodman, Yetta M. and Burke, Carolyn. Reading Miscue Inventory. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Goodman, Yetta. "I Never Read Such a Long Story Before." English Journal, November, 1974. 65-71.

Johnson, Marjorie and Roy A. Kress. Informal Reading Inventories. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1965.

Lowell, Robert E. "Problems in Identifying Reading Levels with Informal Reading Inventories." Durr, William K. (Ed) Reading Difficulties: Diagnosis, Correction, and Remediation, IRA, 1970.

Pilkulski, John. "A Critical Review: Informal Reading Inventories." Reading Teacher., November, 1974.

	INFORMAL READING INVENTORY Johnson & Kress, IRA, 1965	READING MISCUE INVENTORY Goodman & Burke, MacMillan, 1972
Purpose:	Detailed study of whole reading performance	Intensive examination of single reading experience
Material:	Variety of subject areas and types of writing New to child but parallel those materials he will use for instruction	Taken from trade book or text book New to child; story with discernible plot or content with concepts clearly stated and not overly complex
Length:	Controlled so child will not become fatigue	Such that it may be read in entirety within 15 to 20 minutes
Difficulty:	Preprimer through Ninth Grade	One grade level above that which is usually assigned the student in class Selection must generate a minimum of 25 miscues.
Procedures:	Explain testing technque, establish rapport Word recognition test Oral Reading: Child reads from textbook Examiner has copy of the text Begin with passage one level below where child encountered difficulty in word recognition test Accuracy recorded Comprehension questions Silent Reading Behaviors noted Comprehension questions Oral Reading: Next difficulty level Silent Reading Continue increasing difficulty levels until child frustrated Listening, hearing Examiner reads to child Comprehension questions	Inform the student why he is being asked to read. Explain that he will be taped Explain that he will be asked questions following the reading Oral Reading: Child reads from the trade or text book Examiner's worksheet retains physical format of book which student has Miscues marked Retelling of text by the child
Evaluation	Accuracy and Behaviors: Head Movement — Omissions Finger Pointing — Hesitations Substitutions — Word by word Repetitions — Insertions Self-Corrections — Examiner help Word Recognition: Flash Untimed Comprehension: Literal, Interpretive, Problem Solving Grade Placement: Acc. Comp. Independent 99% 90% Instruction 95% 75% Frustration 90% 50%	Miscues marked: Substitutions — Non-word sub. Repetitions: — Dialect diff. self correct — Intonation change form — Pronunciation anticipate next word — Omissions Insertions Partial word Comprehension Pattern: Interaction semantics, graphic/sound symbols and grammar Retelling Score (Recall & Questions) Story: character, Events, Plot, Theme Information Material: Specific, Generalizations, Major Concepts